

Appl. No.: 10/651,137
Reply to Office Action of: July 29, 2005

Remarks

Claims 2-10 and 13-21 are pending in this application. Claims 2-10 and 13-21 stand rejected, the following remarks are addressed to the referenced paragraphs of the Office Action dated July 29, 2005.

Paragraph 1 Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to because of an informality at line 9. Accordingly, claimed 2 is hereby amended according to the Examiner's recommendation

Paragraph 2-3 Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-10, and 13-17, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,039,456) in view of Watanabe et al. (US 4,832,720) and Hattori (US 6,336,821). While the Examiner has asserted that Bowen discloses some of the features of independent claims 2, 13, and 17 he correctly indicates that Bowen does not disclose the plastic carrier having one or more shoulders for primary securing as required by independent claim 2 nor the primary securing and secondary securing mechanisms as required by independent claim 13 nor first and second latching rings required by independent claim 17. Furthermore, the Examiner correctly indicates that Bowen does not disclose the optical fiber portion formed of multi-component glass or a multi-core glass fiber as required by independent claims 2, 13 and 17. The Examiner then relies upon Hattori for a teaching of shoulders to provide a strong coupling between a plug and a socket. The Examiner also relies upon Watanabe for teaching of a multi-core glass fiber. In response, the applicants respectfully assert the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness in issuing this rejection. It is well established that obviousness can not be found by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the

Appl. No.: 10/651,137
Reply to Office Action of: July 29, 2005

combination. Applicants find no teaching, suggestion or incentive to combine these three references as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over independent claims 2, 13 and 17. The Hattori reference is directed to the non-analogous art of an electrical connector for use in a solar generator. There is no teaching or suggestion in the reference to combine its corrugated surfaces on a female housing with the other features of these independent claims, namely, inter alia, two mutually parallel optical fiber ends in which the optical fiber portion is a curved portion guided in an arc of substantially 180° or a multi-component glass core or multi-core glass fiber enveloped in a plastic carrier. The Watanabe reference is directed to the non-analogous art of a method for producing optical fiber. Although a method of producing a multi-core optical fiber is disclosed in the Watanabe reference, the reference does not teach nor suggest the combination of a multi-component glass core or a multi-core glass fiber with the other elements of these independent claims, namely, inter alia, the plug housing, the plug region, and two mutually parallel optical fiber ends in which the optical fiber portion is a curved portion guided in an arc of substantially 180°. With respect to claims 17, none of the references teaches nor suggests first and second matching rings for receiving a latch insert. With respect to claims 19 and 21, the Examiner has not pointed to nor has made any mention of the elements in these claims in his rejection. For example, the Examiner has not established the latch insert of claim 19 nor the slidingly received engagement of the latch insert with the second latching ring as required by claim 21. Since the Examiner has not made a prima facie showing of obvious in rejecting independent claims 2, 13 and 17, nor has the Examiner established the elements of claims 19 and 21 reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No.: 10/651,137
Reply to Office Action of: July 29, 2005

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,039,456) Watanabe et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,832,720) and Hattori (US 6,336,821) as applied to claims 2-10, 13-17 and 19, 21 as applied above, and further in view of Graham, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,952,798). The Examiner asserts that while Bowen does not show two halves of the housing, Graham discloses the same optical simulator 10 comprising a housing having two halves 13 and 14. Claim 18 depends from claim 17 which is patentably distinct from the combination of Bowen, Watanabe and Hattori as described above. Therefore, claim 18 is also patentably distinct from that combination. The addition of Graham to the irrelevant combination of Bowen, Watanabe and Hattori does not teach nor suggest the added limitations of first and second latching rings located on each pillar for receiving a latching insert.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons and in view of the forgoing amendments, Applicants respectfully contend that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments, allowance of claims 1-21 and issuance of Letters Patent for the subject invention. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 50-1581.

Respectfully submitted,



Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39,090
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: (610) 722-3899
Facsimile: (610) 889-3696